

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
5-1-2014	13-CV-00472	(E.D. Va.)	<p>Ellis, et al. v. Swift Transportation Co. of Arizona, LLC</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the Defendant willfully violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (the "FCRA"), §1681b(b)(2), because it did not make a clear and conspicuous disclosure in writing that a consumer report would be obtained for employment purposes, in a document that consisted solely of the disclosure. It is further alleged that the disclosure did not advise consumers that they could receive a free copy of the consumer report within 60 days or that they could dispute the accuracy or completeness of any information contained within the consumer report with the consumer reporting agency.</p> <p>Class Members are all consumers residing in the United States who applied for employment in a Department of Transportation regulated position with Swift via facsimile, telephone, an internet website, electronic mail, regular mail, or through a third party from 7-23-2008 through 9-30-2012, and for whom Swift procured a criminal background, motor vehicle history report, or other consumer report, which was obtained by Swift before there had been at least one in-person interaction with the consumer.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax Defendants' attorney:</p> <p>Snell & Wilmer John F. Lomax, Jr. One Arizona Center 400 East Van Buren St. Suite 1900 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202</p> <p>602 382-6000 (Ph.)</p> <p>602 382-6070 (Fax)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
5-2-2014	10-CV-10392 12-CV-30122	(D. Mass.)	<p>John Gulbankian, Robert D. Callahan, Eric Hartshorn, and Bethany Perry v. MW Manufacturers, Inc. ("MW")</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that MW Vinyl-Clad Windows contain certain design and/or manufacturing defects that make them susceptible to degrading prematurely leading to wood rot, staining warping or discoloration. Plaintiffs bring specific claims under theories of breach of express warranty, breach of implied warranty, unjust enrichment, negligent misrepresentation, negligence, breach of the implied warranty of merchantability, and violation of the Massachusetts Consumer Protection Act.</p> <p>Class Members include all individuals or entities that own or have owned homes, residences, buildings or other structures physically located in the U.S. that contain or have contained vinyl-clad wood-framed windows manufactured by MW from 1-1-1987 to 4-24-2014 [date of Preliminary Approval], including, but not limited to, double-hung, casement, awning, sliding, fixed, special shape, picture, transom and side light windows sold under the names V-Wood, Freedom (a/k/a "Freedom Clad"), Freedom 600 (a/k/a "Builder Series 600" or "Series 600"), Revere or Freedom 800 (a/k/a "Pro Series 800").</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, email or call:</p> <p>Donald R. Frederico Pierce Atwood, LLP 100 Summer Street Boston, MA 02110</p> <p>dfrederico@PierceAtwood.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
5-2-2014	08-MD-2002	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>Processed Egg Products Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Midwest Poultry Services, L.P. ("Midwest"), and certain producers of shell eggs and egg products, conspired to decrease the supply of eggs. Plaintiffs allege that this supply conspiracy limited, fixed, raised, stabilized, or maintained the price of eggs, which caused direct purchasers to pay more for eggs than they would have otherwise paid. The term "eggs" refers to both shell eggs and egg products, which are eggs removed from their shells for further processing into a dried, frozen, or liquid form.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities in the U.S. that purchased eggs, including shell eggs and egg products, produced from caged birds in the U.S. directly from any producer from 1-1-2000 through 7-15-2010.</p>	9-18-2014	<p>For more information write or visit:</p> <p>Michael D. Hausfeld Hausfeld LLP 1700 K Street, NW Suite 650 Washington, DC 20006</p> <p>Stephen D. Susman Susman Godfrey LLP 560 Lexington Ave 15th Floor New York, NY 10022</p> <p>www.eggproductssettlement.com</p>
5-2-2014	06-CV-004804	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Davis v. Chase Bank U.S.A., N.A. Plaintiffs allege that Chase Bank USA, N.A., and before it, Bank One, Delaware, N.A. (together, "Chase"), improperly allocated payments or credits on Circuit City Rewards Credit Cards. Plaintiffs make these claims on behalf of all Chase credit and account holders in California who, between 5-26-2004 and [Date of Preliminary Approval], made a promotional or deferred-interest purchase at Circuit City and who, as a result of payments or credits being allocated first to the promotional or</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Drew Pomerance, Esq. Roxborough, Pomerance, Nye & Adreani, LLP 5820 Canoga Avenue Woodland Hills CA 91367</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>deferred-interest balance, before the regular purchase balance, paid more in finance charges than they would have paid if the payments or credits had first been applied to the regular purchase balance.</p> <p>Class Members are all who were or are a Chase or Bank One Circuit City Rewards Credit Cardholder with a California billing address who made a promotional or deferred-interest purchase at Circuit City and who, as a result of payments or credits being allocated first to the promotional or deferred-interest balance, before the regular purchase balance, paid more in finance charges than if the payments or credits had first been applied to the regular purchase balance between 5-26-2004 through [Date of Preliminary Approval].</p>		
5-5-2014	13-CV-00330	(D. Utah)	<p>James W. Edwards, et al. v. Kirk A. Benson, et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of Headwaters Incorporated against its Board of Directors for breach of fiduciary duties, wasting corporate assets and making false and misleading statements in the 1-7-2013 proxy statement relating to the Board's solicitation of votes for electing directors.</p> <p>Class Members are all owners of Headwaters Incorporated common stock as of 12-31-2012, the record date for the determination of stockholders who were entitled to vote at the 2013 Annual Meeting, including any and all of</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>Levi & Korsinsky, LLP Eduard Korsinsky Steven J. Purcell 30 Broad Street 24th Floor New York, NY 10004</p> <p>212 363-7500 (Ph.)</p> <p>Abbott Law Firm Nelson Abbott 3651 North 100 East Suite 350 Provo, UT 84604</p> <p>801 373-1112 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			their respective successors in interest, predecessors, representatives, trustees, executors, administrators, heirs, assigns, or transferees, immediate and remote, and any person or entity acting for or on behalf of, or claiming under, any of them, and each of them.		
5-5-2014	08-MD-2002	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>In re: Processed Egg Products Antitrust Litigation (National Food Corporation ("NFC")) This Notice relates to Defendant National Food Corporation. (See Notice 5-2-2014, Case No. 08-MD-2002, for Notice relating to Defendant Midwest Poultry Services, L.P.).</p>	9-18-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Weinstein Kitchenoff & Asher LLC 1845 Walnut Street Suite 1100 Philadelphia, PA 19103</p> <p>Hausfeld LLP 1700 K Street NW Suite 650 Washington, DC 20016</p>
5-6-2014	07-CV-4296	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>Moore, et al. v. GMAC Mortgage, LLC, et al. Plaintiffs allege that the portions of the mortgage insurance premiums that certain non-party private mortgage insurance providers ceded to Cap Re of Vermont, LLC ("Cap Re") were disguised kickbacks paid for the referral of private mortgage insurance business. Named Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' conduct violated Section 8 of the Federal Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, 12 U.S.C. §§ 2601 et seq.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who obtained</p>	9-17-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Edward W. Ciolko, Esq. Terence S. Ziegler, Esq. Kessler Topaz Meltzer & Check, LLP 280 King of Prussia Road Radnor, PA 19087</p> <p>Robert M. Bramson, Esq. Bramson, Plutzik, Mahler & Brikhaeuser, LLP 2125 Oak Grove Road Suite 120 Walnut Creek, CA 94598</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			residential mortgage loans originated and/or acquired by GMAC Mortgage, LLC, GMAC Bank (now known as Ally Bank), and/or their affiliates on or after 1-1-2004, with private mortgage insurance which was reinsured by Cap Re.		
5-7-2014	14-CV-376	(D. Minn.)	<p>William Dean v. City of Monticello Supplemental Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement.</p> <p>The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on 9-12-2014. For more information please see 4-24-14 CAFA Notice.</p>	9-12-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Geoffrey H. Coll Schiff Hardin LLP 901 K Street, NW Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20001</p>
5-7-2014	13-CV-11392	(D. Mass.)	<p>Mirabella v. Rue La La, Inc., et al.</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that Rue La La, Inc. ("Rue La La") and its parent company Kynetic LLC ("Kynetic," and together with Rue La La, "Defendants") sold, issued and/or agreed to sell or issue vouchers in violation of the electronic funds Transfer Act (as amended by the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009), the provisions of the Massachusetts gift certificate statute codified at M.G.L. ch. 200A §5D, and in violation of the common law of breach of contract, quasi-contract, and restitution. Plaintiff claims that Rue La La's customers purchased from Rue La La's website vouchers that contained an unlawful expiration date, as set forth in the Complaint.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons in the United</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Charles J. LaDuca Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP 8120 Woodmont Avenue Suite 810 Bethesda, MD 20814</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			States who, on or before 5-3-2013, purchased from Rue La La's website a voucher redeemable for goods and/or services that was subject to an expiration date.		
5-7-2014	12-CV-10513 13-CV-10764	(D. Mass.)	<p>Bezdek v. Vibram USA Inc., et al. De Falco v. Vibram USA Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Vibram violated certain state laws and consumer protection statutes in connection with the marketing and sale of FiveFingers footwear since 3-21-2009. Plaintiffs claim that Vibram, in connection with the marketing and sale of FiveFingers footwear, misrepresented the benefits of wearing FiveFingers footwear to consumers. Plaintiffs further claim that FiveFingers footwear did not provide the benefits to consumers set forth in Vibram marketing and advertising materials.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased FiveFingers footwear during the class period 3-21-2009 through [date of Preliminary Approval]. "FiveFingers footwear" means the following models of Vibram shoes purchased as new: Alitza, Bikila, Bikila EVO, Bikila EVO WP, Bikila LS, Classic, Classic Smartwool, EL-X, Estrada, Flow, Fresca, Jaya, Komodo Sport, Komodo Sport LS, KMD Sport, KMD Sport LS, KSO, KSO EVO, KSO Trek, Lontra, SeeYa, SeeYa LS, SeeYa LS Night, Signa, Speed, Speed XC, Sprint, Spyridon, Spyridon LS, Spyridon MR, Trek LS, TrekSport, TrekSport Sandal, V-On, and Vybrid Sneak.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information visit or write: www.fivefingerssettlement.com Vibram Settlement c/o Heffler Claims Group 1515 Market Street Suite 1700 Philadelphia, PA 19102</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
5-8-2014	09-MD-2075	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re Austin Capital Management, Ltd., Securities & Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation (the "MDL")</p> <p>The lawsuits in the MDL, which arise from the Bernard L. Madoff scandal, allege that the Defendants violated the federal and state securities laws, ERISA, and the common law. The Class Representatives invested in certain Austin Capital funds that in turn made investments in the Rye Select Broad Market Prime Fund, a fund whose investments were managed by Madoff. As a result of Madoff's theft of the assets of the Rye Select Board Market Prime Fund, the Austin Capital funds lost value and the Class Representatives' investments in those Austin Capital funds also lost value. The Class Representatives allege that the Defendants acted imprudently by allowing some of the Austin Capital funds' assets to be invested in the Rye Select Broad Market Prime Fund, that Defendants knew or should have known of the true nature of Madoff's scheme, and that Defendants made false or misleading statements about their investment and due diligence practices.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who held an interest in the Austin Capital All Seasons Offshore Fund, the Austin Capital Safe Harbor ERISA Dedicated Fund, the Austin Capital Safe Harbor Offshore Fund, the Austin Capital Safe Harbor QP Fund, or the Austin Capital Safe Harbor Portable Alpha 1 Fund as of 12-11-2008 (or who are fiduciaries of employee benefit</p>	9-12-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP Samuel H. Rudman David A. Rosenfeld 58 South Service Road Suite 200 Melville, NY 11747</p> <p>Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP Reed R. Kathrein 715 Hearst Avenue Suite 202 Berkeley, CA 94710</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			plans that held such interests).		
5-8-2014	12-CV-05531	(D.N.J.)	<p>Grodko v. Central European Distribution Corp., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made false and/or misleading statements, as well as failed to disclose material adverse facts about the Company's business, operations, and prospects. Specifically, Defendants made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (1) the Company's reported net sales in the years ended 12-31-2010 and 2011 were materially inflated; (2) as a result of its failure to appropriately account for customer rebates, the Company anticipated restating its reported consolidated net sales, operating profit and related accounts receivable for these periods by approximately \$30 to \$40 million; and (3) as a result of the foregoing, the company's statements were materially false and misleading at all relevant times.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased CEDC common stock between 3-1-2010 and 11-13-2012, inclusive, who were damaged thereby.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Claims Administrator c/o Gilardi & Co. LLC P.O. Box 990 Corte Madera, CA 94976-0990</p>
5-8-2014	14-CV-01437	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Greene, et al. v. MTGOX, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege when MtGox, Inc. ("MtGox") stopped all transactions they were unable to access their bitcoins and government-issued currency held by MtGox. Plaintiffs claim that Defendants breached their contracts—as well as</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Jay Edelson Edelson PC 350 North LaSalle Street Suite 1300</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>their fiduciary duties and express trust agreements—by failing to safeguard and segregate Class members' bitcoins and government-issued currency being held by MtGox as promised in MtGox's Terms of Use. Plaintiffs also allege that by failing to implement industry-standard protocols to detect and prevent the improper access and misuse of exchange Class Members' bitcoins and government-issued currency held on MtGox, Defendants breached the duty of care owed to Class Members.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities in the United States and its territories, who had bitcoins or government-issued currency stored with the MtGox Exchange on 2-24-2014.</p>		Chicago, ILL 60654
5-9-2014	12-CV-61826	(S.D. Fla.)	<p>Benzion v. Vivint, Inc. Plaintiff alleges that certain telemarketers made numerous calls that violate the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. §227, promoting the goods and services of Vivint.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities within the U.S. who, at any time from 9-17-2008 through the date of the Settlement Agreement, received one or more covered calls. "Covered calls" means either (1) a call utilizing a pre-recorded message; (2) a call made through the use of automated dialing equipment; or (3) a call made to a telephone number that was registered on the National Do</p>		

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>Not Call Registry or that was on Vivint's internal "Do Not Call" list, where the call described in (1), (2) and/or (3) relates in any way to Vivint products or services or was intended to generate a sales lead to be delivered to Vivint. Covered call includes calls initiated or made by Vivint or by someone acting or purporting to act on behalf of Vivint, relating in any way to Vivint or Vivint's business, including calls made by Vivint's Dealers, Vivint's Telemarketers, Vivint's Lead Generators, Vivint's Marketing Partners, or by anyone seeking to generate leads to be delivered to Vivint, or any call initiated or made by anyone seeking to generate leads for anyone else where the lead sought to be generated from the call ultimately could have been delivered to Vivint or Vivint's Telemarketers, Vivint's Lead Generators, or Vivint's Marketing Partners.</p>		
5-9-2014	12-CV-01644	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Shawn Roberts, et al. v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc., et al. Plaintiffs allege that Frigidaire, Kenmore, White Westinghouse, Kelvinator, Gibson, Crosley, Tappan, or Kenmore brand ball-hitch freestanding clothes dryers (the "Dryers") manufactured by Electrolux in Webster City, Iowa, between 1-1-2002 and 12-31-2011, contain defects that can cause them to catch on fire due to a buildup of lint inside them. The lawsuit further claims that Electrolux breached warranties, was negligent, violated various state consumer protection statutes and</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call: Edward A. Wallace Amy E. Keller Dawn M. Goulet Wexler Wallace LLP 55 West Monroe Street Suite 3300 Chicago, ILL 60603 (312) 346-2222</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>unlawfully profited from the sale of the Dryers.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons in the United States who purchased or currently own a new dryer manufactured by Electrolux between 1-1-2002 and 12-31-2011. The Settlement also includes two Settlement Subclasses that consist of Class Members who (1) have experienced a Dryer fire ("Past Dryer Fire Subclass Members"), and (2) experience a Dryer fire in the future ("Future Dryer Fire Subclass Members").</p>		
5-13-2014	12-CV-1845	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Nevsun Resources Ltd., Clifford T. Davis, Peter J. Hardie, and Scott Trebilcock (collectively, the "Defendants")</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by allegedly materially overstating gold reserves at the Company's Bisha Mine, and allegedly failing to disclose material negative trends about the mine's gold production, during the Class Period. As a consequence, it was alleged that the price of the Company's common stock was artificially inflated during the Class Period.</p> <p>Class Members are all Persons who purchased or otherwise acquired Nevsun common stock from 3-28-2011 through 2-6-2012, inclusive, on the New York Stock Exchange or any other U.S. trading platform.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP Jeffrey P. Campisi 850 Third Avenue 14th Floor New York, NY 10022</p> <p>212 687-1980 (Ph.) 212 687-7714 (Fax)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
5-15-2014	12-CV-820	(N.D.N.Y.)	<p>Casey v. Citibank, N.A., et al. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants MidFirst Bank, doing business as Midland Mortgage ("Midland"), violated the legal rights of borrowers who reside in flood zones by unlawfully forcing them to carry excessive flood insurance coverage for their property, and that Midland and its affiliate, Firstinsure, Inc. ("Firstinsure"), improperly profited from the forced-placement of flood insurance.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons with a mortgage loan owned or serviced by Midland who were sent a flood insurance cycle letter by Midland or who were charged for lender-placed flood insurance by Midland on or after 5-17-2006 through [preliminary approval date].</p>	9-26-2014	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Berger & Montague, P.C. 1622 Locust Street Philadelphia, PA 19103</p> <p>866 222-4935 (Ph.)</p> <p>215 875-4604 (Fax)</p> <p>Nichols Kaster, PLLP 4600 IDS Center 80 South Eighth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402</p> <p>612 256-3241 (Ph.)</p> <p>612 215-6870 (Fax)</p>
5-15-2014	12-CV-00964	(S.D. Cal.)	<p>Knutson, et al. v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc., et al. ("Schwan's") and Customer Elation, Inc. ("Customer Elation") (collectively, "Defendants") Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") by calling consumers' cell phones without prior express consent using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or leaving prerecorded messages.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons in the United States, who are past or present customers of NutriSystem, Inc., who had or have a number</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Joshua B. Swigart Hyde & Swigart 2221 Camino Del Rio South Suite 101 San Diego, CA 92108</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			assigned to a cellular telephone service, which number was called by Schwan's Home Service, Inc. or Customer Elation, Inc. using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or a prerecorded voice between 4-18-2008 and 8-31-2012.		
5-16-2014	06-MD-1775	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' and named Co-Conspirators' single, unitary, global and overarching conspiracy to fix, raise, maintain, or stabilize prices of airfreight shipping services through a number of mechanisms, including, <i>inter alia</i>, concertedly levying inflated Surcharges, jointly agreeing to eliminate or prevent discounting of airfreight shipping services prices, agreeing on rates and yields, and allocating customers.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased airfreight shipping services for shipments to, from or within the United States directly from Settling Defendant, any other Defendant, or from any of their parents, predecessors, successors, subsidiaries, or affiliates, at any time during the period from 1-1-2000, up to and including 9-11-2006.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Hollis L. Salzman Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi 601 Lexington Avenue Suite 3400 New York, NY 10022</p> <p>212 980-7400 (Ph.) 212 980-7499 (Fax)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
5-16-2014	13-CV-1531	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Zeltser, et al. v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. et al. Plaintiffs allege that Merrill Lynch misclassified Field Financial Solutions Advisors ("FSAs") as exempt from federal and state overtime laws and improperly denied FSAs overtime pay.</p> <p>Class Members are all who worked for Merrill Lynch as a field FSA, at a Merrill Lynch retail banking center in New York between 11-15-2006 and 4-30-2014, and/or in California between 9-3-2009 and 4-30-2014. Field FSAs who worked outside of New York and California between 11-15-2012 and 4-30-2014 are also part of the settlement, but they will receive a different notice.</p>	9-23-2014	<p>For more information write, call or visit:</p> <p>Justin M. Swartz Ossai Miazad Jennifer L. Liu Sally J. Abrahamson Outten & Golden LLP 3 Park Avenue 29th Floor New York, NY 10016</p> <p>212 245-1000 (Ph.)</p> <p>MerrillFSASettlement@outtengolden.com</p>
5-16-2014	12-CV-02515	(E.D. Ill.)	<p>Haught v. Motorola Mobility, Inc. Plaintiff alleges that Motorola represented to consumers that it would upgrade the operating system of the CLIQ XT, but ultimately failed to do so.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals and entities in the United States who purchased a Motorola CLIQ XT prior to 2-2-2011.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Rafey S. Balabanian Benjamin H. Richman Christopher L. Dore Edelson PC 350 N. LaSalle Street Suite 1300 Chicago, ILL 60654</p>
5-16-2014	12-CV-5563	(N.D. Ill.)	<p>Vanessa Chavez, Keith Dismukes, and Latasha Turner v. Hat World, Inc. Plaintiffs allege that the Defendant violated the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") and the Illinois Minimum Wage Law (IMWL) alleging,</p>	9-5-2014	<p>For more information write or e-mail:</p> <p>Thomas M. Ryan Law Office of</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>among other things, that Hat World violated those laws by failing to pay proper overtime wages to current and former store managers.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who worked for Defendant as Store Managers throughout the United States at any time between 7-16-2009 and the present who did not receive the full amount of overtime wages earned and owed to them as a result of Defendant's practice of wrongfully misclassifying them as exempt, because they did not customarily and regularly direct the work of two or more other full-time employees or their part-time equivalent.</p>		<p>Thomas M. Ryan P.C. 35 East Wacker Drive Suite 650 Chicago, Illinois 60601</p> <p>tom@tomryanlaw.com</p>
5-19-2014	10-CV-00774	(W.D. Wash.)	<p>Chesbro v. Best Buy Stores, L.P. Plaintiff alleges that Best Buy violated state and federal laws by placing commercial solicitation calls to consumers' telephones without their consent. The Representative Plaintiff claims that the calls at issue violate the Washington Automatic Dialing and Announcing Statute, RCW 80.36.400 (the "WADAD") and violate the federal Do-Not-Call regulations, 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 et seq. ("DNC Rules").</p> <p>Class Members are all who: (1) had a Washington State area code and, between 10-8-2007 and 11-30-2011, received a telephone call, from or on behalf of Best Buy regarding Best Buy's Rewards Zone certificate reminders or its go digital policy, that had been placed using an automated dialer or artificial or</p>	9-19-2014	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p>www.BestBuyAutoCallSettlement.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			pre-recorded voice ("Washington Class"); or (2) did not have a Washington State area code and after requesting that Best Buy not initiate marketing calls, received a telephone call from or on behalf of Best Buy regarding Best Buy's Rewards Zone go digital policy between 10-8-2007 and 11-30-2011 ("National Class").		
5-19-2014	06-CV-00242 09-CV-06151	(E.D. Pa.)	<p>James L. McDonough, et al. v. Toys "R" Us, Inc., d/b/a Babies "R" Us, et al. (collectively, "Babies "R" Us")</p> <p>Ariel Elliott, et al. v. Toys "R" Us, Inc., d/b/a Babies "R" Us, et al. (collectively, "Babies "R" Us")</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Toys "R" Us, Inc. doing business as Babies "R" Us; Babies "R" Us, Inc.; Toys "R" Us-Delaware, Inc. (collectively referred to as "Babies "R" Us"); BabyBjörn AB ("BabyBjörn"); Britax Child Safety, Inc. ("Britax"); Kids Line, LLC ("Kids Line"); Maclaren USA, Inc. n/k/a Amercan Baby Products, Inc. ("Maclaren"); Medela, Inc. ("Medela"); Peg Perego U.S.A., Inc. ("Peg Perego"); and Regal Lager, Inc. ("Regal Lager"), who was Baby Björn's distributor, conspired to implement and enforce policies that would prevent the discounting of certain baby products. The alleged conduct suppressed or eliminated competition that Babies "R" Us faced from internet retailers in violation of federal antitrust laws. As a result, the plaintiffs claim that Babies "R" Us overcharged them for these products.</p>	10-6-2014	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Spector, Roseman, Kodroff & Willis, P.C. 1818 Market Street Suite 2500 Philadelphia, PA 19103</p> <p>215 496-0300</p> <p>www.srkw-law.com</p> <p>Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP 1144 West Lake Street Suite 400 Oak Park, IL 60301-1043</p> <p>706 628-4949</p> <p>www.hbsslaw.com</p> <p>Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLC 270 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016</p> <p>212 545-4600</p> <p>www.whafh.com</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>Class Members are all consumers who purchased the following baby products from Babies "R" Us or Toys "R" Us in the U.S.:</p> <p>Baby Bjorn baby carrier - 2-2-2000 - 4-30-2005 Britax car seat - 1-1-1999 - 1-31-2011 any Kids Line product - 1-1-1999 - 12-31-2006</p> <p>Maclaren stroller; Medela Pump In Style breast pump; Peg Perego cart seat; Peg Perego high chair and Peg Perego stroller - 7-1-1999 - 1-31-2011.</p>		
5-21-2014	11-CV-06247 11-CV-07085 11-CV-02647	(D.N.J.)	<p>In re: Central European Distribution Corp. Tim Schuler, et al. v. Central Euro., Distribution Corp., Christopher Biedermann, and William V. Carey Steamfitter Local 499 Pension Fund, et al. v. Central European Distribution Corp.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the price of Central European Distribution Corp. ("CEDC") common stock was artificially inflated as a result of Defendants' misrepresentation of information omitted from financial statements filed with the SEC.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased the common stock of CEDC between 3-1-2010 and 2-28-2011, inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write:</p> <p>Steven J. Toll Daniel S. Sommers S. Douglas Bunch Genevieve O. Fontan Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC 1100 New York Avenue, N.W. West Tower Suite 500 Washington, DC 20005-3964</p> <p>202 408-4600 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
5-22-2014	10-CV-3383	(N.D. Cal.)	<p>Pinel v. Aurora Loan Services LLC Plaintiff alleges that defendant Aurora Loan Services LLC ("Aurora") violated the legal rights of its customers in the following ways: (a) by sending defaulted California customers a Special Forbearance Agreement ("SFA") that was deceptive under the Rosenthal Unfair Debt Collection Practices Act; (b) by collecting the required payments under SFAs, but not offering customers a bona fide opportunity to cure the arrearages on their loans; and (c) by collecting additional payments after the completion of the term of the SFA, but not offering customers a bona fide opportunity to cure the arrearages on their loans.</p> <p>The Court has certified the following classes for settlement purposes:</p> <p>The Rosenthal Act Settlement Class: All California residential mortgage customers, to whom Aurora sent the "Workout Agreement," later called the "Foreclosure Alternative Agreement," or substantially identical correspondence on or after 6-8-2009.</p> <p>The Restitution Settlement Class: All California residential mortgage customers to whom Aurora sent the "Workout Agreement," later called the "Foreclosure Alternative Agreement," or substantively identical correspondence on or after 6-8-2009, who made the trial payments required by their final workout Agreement, did not thereafter enter</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Ali Abtahi Abtahi Law Firm 1012 Torney Avenue San Francisco, CA 94129 415 639-9800 (Ph.) 415 639-9801 (Fax)</p> <p>Andrew Oldham Law Office of Andrew Oldham 901 Campisi Way Suite 248 Campbell, CA 95008 (888) 842-4930 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			into a repayment plan or HAMP trial payment plan, were not thereafter offered a loan modification by Aurora, and were thereafter foreclosed upon.		
5-22-2014	05-CV-00201	(M.D. Fla.)	<p>In re: MIVA, Inc. Securities Litigation Plaintiff alleges that FindWhat, its Chief Executive Officer and President violated the federal securities laws by making false and misleading statements in certain press releases and public findings issued during the Class Period or controlling the persons who made those statements.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased the common stock of FindWhat between 2-23-2005 and 5-4-2005, inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Lester R. Hooker Saxena White P.A. 2424 N. Federal Hwy. Suite 257 Boca Raton, FL 33431</p>
5-22-2014	09-CV-07560	(C.D. Cal.)	<p>Peter Wilson v. Gateway, Inc. Plaintiff alleges that he and similarly-situated customers were unable to obtain repair service for their Gateway computers under the terms of their Extended Service Plan ("ESP"). Plaintiff asserts violations of certain California consumer protection statutes and common law.</p> <p>Class Members are all U.S. residents who: 1) purchased a computer from Gateway's Professional Division prior to 12-1-2008; 2) purchased an Extended Service Plan ("ESP") to supplement the limited manufacturer's warranty for the computer, and whose ESP had not</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Caldwell, Leslie & Proctor, PC 725 South Figueroa Street 31st Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017</p> <p>Denlea & Carton LLP One North Broadway Suite 509 White Plains, NY 10601</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			expired as of 12-1-2008.		
5-23-2014	10-CV-09260	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Manno, et al. v. MAXAM Capital GP, LLC, et al. Plaintiffs allege direct and derivative claims against the MAXAM Defendants, including direct claims for securities fraud under Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") and control person liability under Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act against Defendants MAXAM Capital and Manzke, as well as direct and derivative claims for common law fraud, negligent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, gross negligence and mismanagement, and unjust enrichment against the MAXAM Defendants, in connection with the MAXAM Defendants' investment of Maxam Absolute Return Funds, L.P. ("MARF's") assets with Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities ("BLMIS").</p> <p>Class Members are all limited partners in MARF who purchased or held interests in MARF and were limited partners of MARF as of 12-10-2008, and who suffered a net loss of equity on their investments.</p>	8-22-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Daniel W. Krasner Demet Basar Maja Lukic Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP 270 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016</p>
5-23-2014	09-CV-02941	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p>Bodon, et al. v. Domino's Pizza LLC ("Domino's") Plaintiffs allege that Domino's added delivery charges to delivery orders, and that a reasonable consumer would believe those charges to be a tip for the delivery driver, but that Domino's did not distribute those</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>George Hanson Ashlea Schwart Stueve Siegel Hanson 460 Nichols Road Suite 200 Kansas City, MO 64112</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>charges to the delivery drivers. Plaintiffs contended that these delivery charges were "gratuities" under New York laws that belong to the delivery drivers. Plaintiffs also alleged that Domino's failed to reimburse New York delivery drivers and customer service representatives ("CSRs") for certain expenses, including but not limited to the purchase of alleged "uniform" items, in connection with their employment with Domino's, and that Domino's was obligated, but did not, provide a uniform maintenance allowance to its New York delivery drivers and CSRs.</p> <p>Class Members are all who were employed by Domino's as a delivery driver or CSR at any Domino's-owned store in the State of New York between 7-9-2003 and 3-2-2014.</p>		<p>816 714-7100 (Ph.)</p> <p>Mark Potashnick Weinhaus & Potashnick 11500 Olive Boulevard Suite 133 St. Louis, MO 63141</p> <p>314 997-9150 ext. 2 (Ph.)</p>
5-23-2014	12-CV-05034	(N.D.Cal.)	<p>Maritime Asset Management, LLC v. NeurogesX, Inc., et al.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege Defendants Tobias and NeurogesX, Inc. failed to disclose to investors in a 7-21-2011 Securities Purchase Agreement that Tobias would be leaving NeurogesX, Inc and would join a competitor's firm. Tobias's resignation as Chief Medical Officer and Executive Vice President left a prominent void in NeurogesX, Inc.'s ability to obtain FDA approval for its pain management drugs and its resulting ability to market such medications. Plaintiffs allege this material misrepresentation caused the value of NeurogesX stock to drop 50% by 10-3-2011 and</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Mark Punzalan 600 Alerton Street Suite 201 Redwood City, CA 94063</p> <p>650 362-4150 (Ph.)</p> <p>650 362-4151 (Fax)</p> <p>Nicholas I. Porritt Thomas M. Gottschlick Levi & Korsinsky LLP 1101 30th Street, NW Suite 115 Washington, DC 20007</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>thus harmed investors.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired the securities of Neuroges X, Inc. between 5-9-2011 through 9-27-2011, inclusive.</p>		<p>202 524-4290 (Ph.)</p> <p>202 337-1567 (Fax)</p>
5-23-2014	11-CV-5196	(D.N.J.)	<p>Ricky Dudley v. Christian W.E. Haub, Eric Claus, Brenda M. Galgano, Ronald Marshall, Samuel Martin, The Yucaipa Companies LLC, Ronald Burkle and Frederic Brace</p> <p>Plaintiff allege that Defendants acted with scienter in that Defendants knew that the public documents and statements issued or disseminated in the name of the company were materially false and misleading; knew that such statements or documents would be issued or disseminated to the investing public; and knowingly and substantially participated or acquiesced in the issuance or dissemination of such statements or documents as primary violations of the federal securities laws.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased A&P publicly-traded securities between 7-23-2009 and 12-10-2010, inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>Rick Nelson c/o Shareholder Relations Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP 655 West Broadway Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101</p> <p>1 800 449-4900 (Ph.)</p>
5-28-2014	11-CV-09051	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Yang v. Focus Media Holding Limited, et al.</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that the Focus Media and the individual Defendants misrepresented or omitted material information regarding certain Company acquisitions, write-downs and divestitures of assets, valuations of Company</p>	9-4-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Timothy MacFall Rigrodsky & Long, P.A. 825 East Gate Boulevard Suite 300</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>subsidiaries, and the Company's description of its LCD advertising network and certain related operating data.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired American Depository Shares of Focus Media between 11-20-2007 and 11-21-2011, inclusive.</p>		Garden City, NY 11530
5-29-2014	13-CV-0715	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>In re: NYC Bus Tour Antitrust Litigation Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal and state antitrust laws by limiting competition and conspiring to fix prices in the alleged market for hop-on, hop-off bus tours in New York City.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who, or entities that, directly purchased "hop-on, hop-off" bus tours from Defendants beginning 3-17-2009, until the effects of Defendants' anticompetitive conduct cease.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call fax or e-mail:</p> <p>William Christopher Carmody Arun Subramanian Mark Howard Hatch-Miller SUSMAN GODFREY LLP 560 Lexington Avenue 15th Floor New York, NY 10022</p> <p>212 336-8330 (Ph.) 212 336-8340 (Fax)</p> <p>bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com asubramanian@susmangodfrey.com</p>
5-30-2014	11-CV-8205	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p>Kevin Royer, et al. v. J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., et al. Plaintiffs allege Chase failed to properly compensate business bankers for overtime, or hours worked in excess of forty per workweek, by misclassifying business bankers as exempt employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act,</p>	9-11-2014	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Denise Schulman Joseph & Kirschenbaum LLP 233 Broadway 5th Floor New York, NY 10279</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices
in May 2014, to the
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Contact Information
			<p>(“FLSA”).</p> <p>Class Members are all persons employed by Defendants as business bankers at any time in a covered state during the covered periods. The covered period means: (a) for New York locations, the period from 11-14-2005 through 4-1-2013; (b) for New Jersey from 11-14-2009 through 4-1-2013; and (c) for any states other than New York, New Jersey, and California, from 8-16-2010 through 4-1-2013.</p>		<p>212 688-5640 (Ph.)</p> <p>denise@jhllp.com</p> <p>David Harrison Harrison & Associates, LTD</p> <p>718 799-9111 (Ph.)</p> <p>nycotlaw@gmail.com</p>